From:
 Miller, Garyg

 To:
 Turner, Philip

 Cc:
 Sanchez, Carlos

Subject: FW: Steve Ells Comment on San Jacinto FS

Date: Thursday, April 07, 2016 9:48:00 AM

Phil.

Below is an email from Steve Ells asking about the San Jacinto sediment cleanup level being higher than others & I couldn't find if we ever had an answer; this will come up again in the NRRB, so we should be able to talk to this. Also, I am revising the feasibility study & need to include a PRG we are going with, so can you check into this?

Thanks,

Gary Miller
Remedial Project Manager
EPA Region 6 – Superfund Division (6SF-RA)
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

From: Turner, Philip

Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 8:41 AM **To:** Miller, Garyg < Miller.Garyg@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Steve Ells Comment on San Jacinto FS

Multiple sources themselves would not make it higher, but other fishing options would. For example, in the San Jacinto River folks can fish in lots of different places. At these sites... maybe their fishing spots are more restricted.

From: Miller, Garyg

Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 8:34 AM

To: Turner, Philip

Subject: RE: Steve Ells Comment on San Jacinto FS

Phil,

Those other sites may have been a single source, but I'm not clear on why multiple sources would make it higher???

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov



From: Turner, Philip

Sent: Monday, June 30, 2014 12:03 PM

To: Miller, Garyg

Subject: RE: Steve Ells Comment on San Jacinto FS

There are PCLs for fishing... Recreational Fisher and Subsistence Fisher (although the subsistence fisher was not carried forward in the FS). I wonder If fish from these other site were contaminated by dioxins of a single source. San Jac fish have accumulated stuff from all over the watershed.

From: Miller, Garyg

Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 7:57 AM

To: Turner, Philip

Subject: Steve Ells Comment on San Jacinto FS

Phil,

Below is a comment the Steve Ells made regarding the San Jacinto cleanup level – can you prepare a response?

Thanks,

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

5 – Why is the sediment PCL of 220 ppt based on a recreational visitor scenario? It is very high compared to other sites. At all dioxin sites, the cleanup level or remediation goal is much lower for fish consumption. There is an RAO for fish consumption, but no corresponding PCL or RG. At Centredale Manor it was 15 ppt, and at the Passaic River, the Proposed Plan used 7.1; both were based on a HI of 1. The risk-based protective concentration in fish tissue at the Passaic is 1.4 ppt. The current conc. of dioxins in fish should be stated, as well as the baseline risk that exposure pathway represents.
